



would resort for their accomplishment will appear by the following extract from his oration:—

'Law distinctly, that my object is not only to make a constitutional question: I mean to avail myself of the position which Georgia has so lately assumed, to bring to an issue the cause in which the abolitionists have so long been working, and pressing on us. I have labored and reflected on the question long, and with a profound impression of its importance; and it seems to me (with all deference for the opinions of those who may differ from me, I speak it,) that now is our time.'

The State of Georgia has clearly the right of the whole controversy, as now presented. Two of these fanatics, impelled by their insolent and diabolical notions of philanthropy, have wantonly committed upon her borders, a deed which, if duly proved upon them, (and we are informed the evidence is almost unquestionable,) amounts to a treason. On these felonies transaction, the people of the country have found a 'true bill,' and under that bill, the Governor of Georgia, by the direction of her Legislature, has demanded, according to the provisions of the constitution, the delinquents for trial. It only, therefore, remains for the State of Maine to perform her necessary and common duty, as a member of our Union, to bring these culprits to condign punishment.'

If she acquiesces in this just and righteous demand, they will then be made to suffer the penalties of infamy, and abolition will receive a lesson that will be long and deeply remembered. A check, which will, at the same time, give the slaveholding States from their too long inaction, and teach those who have so recklessly embarked in their crusade of injustice and false philanthropy against their countrymen, to pause and reflect on the utter folly and impudence of it, however sacred it might seem to them, under the gloss of a false and mortal religion.'

So according to Mr. Rhett, the true means of establishing the character of the South, for 'charity'—for 'philanthropy' and 'humanity'—is to refuse all the calls of justice, to hold out, and to satisfy the world, that slavery is an excellent institution, and that the slaves of the South, are 'clothed, fed, and protected with the care and kindness which the people of the South show to their children and their friends;—the true means to establish and prove all this is, to catch and hang two northern abolitionists, and on the charge of having aided a slave to escape from his master!—This method of demonstration is certainly very compounding; but whether out of South Carolina, it would prove perfectly satisfactory, is perhaps a little doubtful.

We now come to the State of Alabama. The following amusing account of an abolition scene in the Legislature of that State, is from the *Tarzana's Liberator*:

'EXCITEMENT IN THE HOUSE.—The lower House of the Legislature, on Tuesday last, made the State a new year's present of its power of enlightenment upon the inflammatory subject of abolition as connected with party politics. The excitement arose from the last resolution of the amendment of Mr. Payne of Sumter, Judge Smith's resolutions, with a proposal of a resolution, on the grounds of the nature of the administration, on the grounds of its sound policy and principles, past and present. The amendment, Mr. Baldwin of Montgomery moved to lay upon the table. Mr. Payne went into a debate, at some length, of his amendment, and in the course of his remarks, took occasion to make some impassioned and very animated observations upon the league, which he supposed to have been formed between the northern Whigs and abolitionists, and expressed deep mortification, that there were physicians who were, in his opinion, sustaining those accursed fanatics, by their support of a Whig candidate for the Presidency. The speech of Mr. Payne was made under much apparent excitement, and was, in its matter, sufficiently fiery. Mr. Hillard of Montgomery followed in the debate, and avowing himself to be entirely southern in his feelings, interests, partialities, and even prejudices, yet could not support Mr. Van Buren, because such support was inconsistent with every view he was enabled to take of sound policy. He was welcome to wear it. He said that it was his duty to make no application to any one in the House, but that the denial of the gentleman was suspicious, and if Junius was to be believed, indicated the truth of what it denoted.'

Mr. Porter, of Tuscaloosa, rose under great excitement.—He spoke with much earnestness and warmth in repudiation of the idea that there existed the slightest affiliation between southern Whigs and the desperades at the North, who were carrying on their nefarious designs against the South. He could not remain silent when insinuations were made implicating him, a southern man, in every interest, and feeling, and aspiration—with which his childhood and youth had been educated by the torments of which the accusers of the negro population—when *are*, holding these miscreants as he did, in utter abhorrence—was suspected of giving them countenance, or in any manner lending them aid. He spurned from him the insinuations with the loftiest and most indignant scorn. He hurled it back to the source whence it came. He averred that instead of the Whigs contending with the abolitionists.

The Democratic party of the North had concluded, Mr. Porter rose also, and exerted himself to repel the organically he meant nothing personal to any member, but now as gentlemen seemed so morbidly sensitive on the subject, he would say that there were men in the South—aye, continued Mr. P. upon this door who!'

Order was called by the chair, which remarked that the rules of the House forbade any gentleman from making personal reflections upon members.

Mr. Payne.—'If the Sergeant at Arms can keep me in order let him do it.' The Chair repeated the requisition, and Mr. P. continued his aspercence, and shortly after took his seat.

Mr. Hillard, Mr. Shields, Mr. Sherrington, Mr. Wright of Perry, and Mr. Young, the latter with the most powerful and effective eloquence, spoke upon the question. Mr. Moore of Marengo, made a speech characterised by its temper and pleasantness, which had considerable effect in restoring good humor.

Judge Smith also spoke. The storm which looked, at one time, a little threatening, subsided—so storms generally do—about sun set. We trust that no such inflammatory matter will be again thrown into the House.'

These mutual accusations of being in secret league with the abolitionists, are not confined to the Alabama Legislature. The newspapers, the legislative debates, and the speeches of the southern members of Congress, are full of it. Each party accuses the other of secretly plotting with northern 'incendiaries and desperadoes'; and a candid man, taking all the charges and allegations on both sides into the account, would be apt to come to the conclusion that about all the leading politicians of the South, of all parties, and indeed the great mass of the southern population, were abolitionists at least, but that they were not so numerous as to be far from the intention of our southern friends to convey such impressions. Indeed, they tell us every now and then that upon this subject, the South is united as one man. But certainly the freedom and equality with which they charge each other with being leagued with the abolitionists, does not seem to square very well with that assertion.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS. This gentleman, in presenting some anti-slavery petitions to Congress on the 21st ultimo, took occasion (after stating that he was continually receiving letters threatening him with assassination) 'distinctly to say to the House, to the country, and to the world, that if the question of the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia were to be put this day, HE WOULD VOTE AGAINST IT!' This declaration nips in the bud the hopes of many abolitionists, respecting the future course of Mr. Adams on the floor of Congress. The loss of the right of petition is merely a consequence growing out of the existence of slavery in the District of Columbia. Mr. Adams has been zealous in protesting against an effect, and yet declares that he is resolved not to strike at the cause! This is indeed to labor in vain, and to spend one's strength for naught. What political foresight and consistency! We are glad to perceive that Mr. Adams does not deny that Congress has the constitutional power to abolish slavery in the District. It is upon the altar of expediency that he is disposed to immolate the inalienable rights of the victims of slavery groaning out a miserable existence within the 'ten miles square.' We lament that it is so. We shall try to copy his remarks into our next paper.

ELOQUENCE. The meeting of the State Anti-Slavery Society, which was held in the House of Representatives on the evening of the 24th ult., was thronged to excess. It so happened that we were not present; but we have heard the proceedings described as remarkably interesting. The speech of Wendell Phillips—an extempore effort—is on all hands conceded to have been one of the most finished and powerful attempts at oratory ever listened by any public assembly. He drew a striking contrast between the past and the present, and came down with annihilating effect upon that matchless imposture, the colonization scheme.

THE TEMPERANCE PARABLE has been published in the Liberator.

## MASSACHUSETTS A. S. SOCIETY.

### SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT.

*Extracts from the Seventh Annual Report of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society.*

#### ELECTION IN THE FOURTH DISTRICT.

Since the standard of emancipation was first flung out to the breeze, no local election in this country has excited so intense and wide an interest as that which is now pending in old Middlesex. It not only happens that the rival political parties are nearly balanced, so that a very small *corps du recrue* can prevent a choice; but it also happens that a large portion of the electoral strength in the District belongs to the abolitionists, who, it is estimated, if true to their principles, might easily cast some twelve or fifteen hundred votes.

Holding, then, in their hands, the balance of power overwhelmingly, for them to allow any but a tried and undoubted friend of immediate emancipation to succeed, would be a burning disgrace to themselves, and make political abolition a hissing and a proverb. How faithfully they have withheld all attempts to put them in party traces,—with what ease they have twice defeated an election,—who that 'hath ears to hear' and eyes to see, has not heard and witnessed? Another trial is to be made on the first Monday in February, the same obnoxious candidates being in nomination. On the first trial there were more than 300, on the second more than 600 scattering votes cast. On the third, it is confidently expected the number will be greatly augmented—and so on, until one or both of the rival parties shall consult the rights of the North, and the claims of bleeding humanity, in nominating a suitable candidate.

If Messrs. Brooks and Carpenter had been *around* hostile to the anti-slavery cause, a much stronger opposition would have been brought out against them; but every effort was made by their partisans, to induce the abolition electors to believe that they were 'good men and true,' the fast friends of immediate emancipation. Some of the leading whig organs—compromises, for the last five years, for their unmitigated opposition to our principles and measures,—gravely expressed their astonishment, that any fault should be found with the abolitionism of Nathan Brooks! It was pronounced to be of a genuine stamp, ultra even to the letting down of the heavens, if justice were only done! These story-tellers were too foolish to perceive, that *their* very endorsement of Mr. B.'s anti-slavery character furnished strong circumstantial, not to say positive evidence of its unsoundness. In declaring his coin to be pure gold, they proved it to be counterfeit. On the other hand, the papers friendly to William Carpenter asserted, that the spirit of his abolitionism was at least 100 per cent better than that of Mr. Brooks! These short but deceptive representations,—joined to that sorcery-spell of party, from which so few of the people have been able wholly to emancipate themselves—dothfully induced a number of abolition voters, whose vision is yet somewhat imperfect, to cast their suffrages in favor of these candidates, according to their party predilections—while others refrained from going to the polls, deeming it a matter of small consequence which way the scale might turn. In profession, therefore, the entire District assumed to be abolitionists—5 fact which 'our southern brethren' are particularly requested to chronicle in their note-book!

In respect to political action, the following is the course marked out by abolitionists to be pursued, with an undeviating step:

First, to interrogate all candidates for a seat in Congress, respecting their views on the subject of slavery and the slave trade, the admission of new slave states, the right of petition, &c.

Second, to vote for no man who refuses to reply, or whose answer is evasive or unsatisfactory.

Third, to make the doctrine of immediate emancipation the test-question.

Fourth, to regard the cause of the bondman as paramount to all party considerations—and, therefore,

Fifth, to vote for the candidate who appears to be the most tract-worthy, whether he is called whig or democrat, or by whatever party name.

Guided by these plain rules, no consistent abolitionist residing in the Fourth District, can vote for either of the candidates now in nomination.

The reply of Mr. Carpenter is radically defective upon the main question. He is, of course, in favor of *free discussion and the right of self-government*; and *several population*—when *are*, holding these miscreants as he did, in utter abhorrence—was suspected of giving them countenance, or in any manner lending them aid. He spurned from him the insinuations with the loftiest and most indignant scorn. He hurled it back to the source whence it came. He averred that instead of the Whigs contending with the abolitionists.

The Democratic party of the North had concluded, Mr. Phillips rose also, and exerted himself to repel the organically he meant nothing personal to any member, but now as gentlemen seemed so morbidly sensitive on the subject, he would say that there were men in the South—aye, continued Mr. P. upon this door who!

Mr. Brooks persists in refusing to reply to the interrogations propounded to him. In so doing, he does not wish to be considered as lacking in courtesy, but conscientiously scrupulous on the sense of duty. However satisfactory his reasons may appear to himself, the fact that he is unwilling to avow his opinions on fundamental questions, justly and necessarily precludes him from receiving the sufferings of abolitionists. It is his misfortune, if not his fault, that he cannot speak out his thoughts on all topics of importance,—especially respecting the sundering of human yokes and fetters, and the rightfulness of delivering him that is spoiled out of the hand of the oppressor. It is not a ploy, but an expression of opinion, an avowal of present conviction, that is solicited of him—though, if he really apprehends and cherishes the *self-evident truths* of the Declaration of Independence, he believes in the inalienable rights of man, he ought not to shrink; for one moment, in pledging himself, by his allegiance to God and his abhorrence of tyranny, that he will do all that in his power to procure, forthwith and forever, the emancipation of the men, women, and children, who are by a bloody edict of Congress held in chains and slavery. He cannot excuse himself, for not returning to the law of the land, who is far from the intention of our southern friends to comprehend such impressions. Indeed, they tell us every now and then that upon this subject, the South is united as one man. But certainly the freedom and equality with which they charge each other with being leagued with the abolitionists, does not seem to square very well with that assertion.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS. This gentleman, in presenting some anti-slavery petitions to Congress on the 21st ultimo, took occasion (after stating that he was continually receiving letters threatening him with assassination) 'distinctly to say to the House, to the country, and to the world, that if the question of the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia were to be put this day, HE WOULD VOTE AGAINST IT!' This declaration nips in the bud the hopes of many abolitionists, respecting the future course of Mr. Adams on the floor of Congress. The loss of the right of petition is merely a consequence growing out of the existence of slavery in the District of Columbia. Mr. Adams has been zealous in protesting against an effect, and yet declares that he is resolved not to strike at the cause! This is indeed to labor in vain, and to spend one's strength for naught. What political foresight and consistency!

We are glad to perceive that Mr. Adams does not deny that Congress has the constitutional power to abolish slavery in the District. It is upon the altar of expediency that he is disposed to immolate the inalienable rights of the victims of slavery groaning out a miserable existence within the 'ten miles square.'

We lament that it is so. We shall try to copy his remarks into our next paper.

ELOQUENCE. The meeting of the State Anti-Slavery Society, which was held in the House of Representatives on the evening of the 24th ult., was thronged to excess. It so happened that we were not present; but we have heard the proceedings described as remarkably interesting. The speech of Wendell Phillips—an extempore effort—is on all hands conceded to have been one of the most finished and powerful attempts at oratory ever listened by any public assembly. He drew a striking contrast between the past and the present, and came down with annihilating effect upon that matchless imposture, the colonization scheme.

THE TEMPERANCE PARABLE has been published in the Liberator.

many similar instances, in this and other States, in which candidates have refused to answer the queries submitted to them, on the ground that they cherished too high a regard for individual freedom and independence to make any pledge, or express any opinion, in relation to the manner in which, if elected, they will discharge the highest and most solemn obligations that can rest upon accountable beings!

In order to breed mutual distrust and jealousy in the minds of the abolition voters in the Fourth District, it has been falsely asserted by the whig organs, that nearly all the scattering votes have been cast by the whigs; that democratic abolitionists have closely allied to their party views; and that all this excitement is an artful manoeuvre on the part of 'democracy,' to ruin elector William Carpenter by the aid of whigs.

Let us at once admit that there is sin in forbidding marriage and the reading of the Bible, and in marketing man as beasts, on the other, they are found pleading with paternal solicitude, that the system whence these blasphemies naturally and necessarily flow, may be spared a little longer. Living in such a world where even the exponents of religion approve the disjoining of parents from professors, we cannot safely inter a man's property from his admitted principles.

But we will, then you would have been contented with the joint-declaration of the whig candidates for Congress in your district, that slavery is a moral evil!

But living in a land of expediency—India-rubber-christianity, this admission, that slavery is sin, gave you no sufficient reason, nor indeed any reason at all for concluding, that the candidates, who made the admission, would, if elected, treat slavery as a sin, and exert their influence for its immediate overthrow.

Let it be distinctly understood, that the form of government, which I recommend, is one that protects the rights of individuals, and invades not the rights of the State, in accordance with the terms of our Constitution.

But it must be remembered, that we live in a land, where a decided majority of the public teachers of religion admit the plea of expediency for waiving the application of even the fundamental principles of that religion.

Whilst, on the one hand, many of them are constrained to admit, that there is sin in forbidding marriage and the reading of the Bible, and in market-

ing man as beasts, on the other, they are found pleading with paternal solicitude, that the system whence these blasphemies naturally and necessarily flow, may be spared a little longer. Living in such a world where even the exponents of religion approve the disjoining of parents from professors, we cannot safely inter a man's property from his admitted principles.

But we will, then you would have been contented with the joint-declaration of the whig candidates for Congress in your district, that slavery is a moral evil!

But living in a land of expediency—India-rubber-christianity, this admission, that slavery is sin, gave you no sufficient reason, nor indeed any reason at all for concluding, that the candidates, who made the admission, would, if elected, treat slavery as a sin, and exert their influence for its immediate overthrow.

Let it be distinctly understood, that the form of government, which I recommend, is one that protects the rights of individuals, and invades not the rights of the State, in accordance with the terms of our Constitution.

But it must be remembered, that we live in a land, where a decided majority of the public teachers of religion admit the plea of expediency for waiving the application of even the fundamental principles of that religion.

Whilst, on the one hand, many of them are constrained to admit, that there is sin in forbidding marriage and the reading of the Bible, and in market-

ing man as beasts, on the other, they are found pleading with paternal solicitude, that the system whence these blasphemies naturally and necessarily flow, may be spared a little longer. Living in such a world where even the exponents of religion approve the disjoining of parents from professors, we cannot safely inter a man's property from his admitted principles.

But we will, then you would have been contented with the joint-declaration of the whig candidates for Congress in your district, that slavery is a moral evil!

But living in a land of expediency—India-rubber-christianity, this admission, that slavery is sin, gave you no sufficient reason, nor indeed any reason at all for concluding, that the candidates, who made the admission, would, if elected, treat slavery as a sin, and exert their influence for its immediate overthrow.

Let it be distinctly understood, that the form of government, which I recommend, is one that protects the rights of individuals, and invades not the rights of the State, in accordance with the terms of our Constitution.

But it must be remembered, that we live in a land, where a decided majority of the public teachers of religion admit the plea of expediency for waiving the application of even the fundamental principles of that religion.

Whilst, on the one hand, many of them are constrained to admit, that there is sin in forbidding marriage and the reading of the Bible, and in market-

ing man as beasts, on the other, they are found pleading with paternal solicitude, that the system whence these blasphemies naturally and necessarily flow, may be spared a little longer. Living in such a world where even the exponents of religion approve the disjoining of parents from professors, we cannot safely inter a man's property from his admitted principles.

But we will, then you would have been contented with the joint-declaration of the whig candidates for Congress in your district, that slavery is a moral evil!

But living in a land of expediency—India-rubber-christianity, this admission, that slavery is sin, gave you no sufficient reason, nor indeed any reason at all for concluding, that the candidates, who made the admission, would, if elected, treat slavery as a sin, and exert their influence for its immediate overthrow.

Let it be distinctly understood, that the form of government, which I recommend, is one that protects the rights of individuals, and invades not the rights of the State, in accordance with the terms of our Constitution.

But it must be remembered, that we live in a land, where a decided majority of the public teachers of religion admit the plea of expediency for waiving the application of even the fundamental principles of that religion.

Whilst, on the one hand, many of them are constrained to admit, that there is sin in forbidding marriage and the reading of the Bible, and in market-

ing man as beasts, on the other, they are found pleading with paternal solicitude, that the system whence these blasphemies naturally and necessarily flow, may be spared a little longer. Living in such a world where even the exponents of religion approve the disjoining of parents from professors, we cannot safely inter a man's property from his admitted principles.

But we will, then you would have been contented with the joint-declaration of the whig candidates for Congress in your district, that slavery is a moral evil!

But living in a land of expediency—India-rubber-christianity, this admission, that slavery is sin, gave you no sufficient reason, nor indeed any reason at all for concluding, that the candidates, who made the admission, would, if elected, treat slavery as a sin, and exert their influence for its immediate overthrow.

Let it be distinctly understood, that the form



## LITERARY.

**FRIEND GARRISON:** I read with much surprise a communication in your paper of the 4th inst. purporting to be the production of Mr. Folsom, Editor of the *Gospel Witness*, etc. How well the sentiments contained in that article will chime with the title which Mr. F. has selected for his paper, I leave those who know what the Gospel is, to decide. It is matter of surprise to me that a man, who inculcates love to all mankind as a sacred duty enjoined upon every individual, should utter sentiments so diametrically opposed to the exercise of such love. I can assure Mr. F. if God does not love the black man much better than he does, He will not be the Saviour of all men. The following thoughts, elicited by the article above referred to, are submitted for publication in the *Liberator*, if you deem them worthy of publicity.

## TO REV. MR. FOLSON.

Dost thou believe that God loves all, whatever their form or hue? That He will hit them with the pestilence, and let them die? The glories of His blessed abode, And share its sacred joys; And subjects to its peaceful eude, Eternally rejoice? How canst thou, then, the idea suggest Of doing good to all? What's taught to leave thy brother out, Though black as death's dark pall? Did Jesus tell us we might love None but the white man's soul? Did he declare, Ye're placed above The black man, to control His body, and his mind to tramp With tyrant-foot in dust? Did His white or black embast His glorious image first? When thou canst prove that Christ loves not Thy darker brother, then I'll prove to thee that He is not The Saviour of all men! Though thou thy priestly visage fix On woman, and in wrath Denounce her if she open her lips, To lure in wisdom's path, Those who from truth and right have strayed; Yet it is plain to see That thou the recreant part hast played— Mong traitors shalt thou be. Go, learn physician, heal thyself; Go, love in Freedom's fount; Say to the tyrant, quit thyself! Then give thy last account.

Boston, Jan. 11th, 1839.

## PEACE.

PEACE—is a blessed word— Blessed are the sons of peace, Who following their ascended Lord,— From strife and wrangling cease. Peace reigns in heaven supreme— It makes that kingdom love— And it will be the noblest theme Of all who reign above. Peace Jesus sought to make, When from the skies he came;— And who a brother's life can take, Yet love his holy name? The men of peace will ne'er Approve battles fought— Or in the martial deep appear, With pride and fully fraught. Orphans and widows made, With none their pains to share— By men who bloody oceans wade An earthly crown to wear. Will kindle deep disgust Within his peaceful brest, Who puts in Heaven his only trust, And blessing man is blest. Great God, speed on the day When all will follow peace— When brothers will not brothers slay, And wars and fightings cease.

D. C. C.

Portland.

## THE VOICE OF LIBERTY.

\* And that, knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep!—[Romans.] Oh! the world from its trance is awaking, With the spring of regenerate youth; And the error-fred people are shaking Their third, the fountain of truth. Oh! the cancer-worm, custom, was eating Its way through the veins of the age, Till man like a wild-hen, seemed hatching His breast on the bars of his cage. Hark! a voice to the nations hath spoken, In tones that have startled the world. \* Let the dark chain of error break— Let LIBERTY's flag be unfurled! For time and progressive opinion Shall conquer where cohorts shall fail, And freedom assert her dominion— Hail!—Freedom—all hail!

The war-fields, sin-spotted and gory, No longer shall gorge on mankind, For the Sun of a new day of glory Flames far' o'er the empire of mind. Man's spirit is quickly surmounting The vapor that veiled it in night, And now like a long pent up fountain, Its waters are gushing to light. From the heavens dark shadows are gleaming, From the earth a thick mist rolls away, And the rainbow of hope reappearing, Brightens the day, the day. Ye helots shrink back now in terror, To the dena where lost tyranny lies— Light dawns on the long night of error, The PHAROS of freedom will rise.

From the Emancipator.

## APPROPRIATE SPHERE OF WOMAN.

\* Carrying about petitions to legislative bodies and soliciting signatures is not the appropriate sphere for ladies.—The *Lords of Creation*.

Tell me not of women's station,  
Tell me not we leave our 'sphere,'  
When we urge by mild persuasion,  
Rights to every woman dear.

When her back is stained and gory,  
When her tears in anguish flow,  
Shall we then not heed her story—  
Her sad tale of grief and woe?

When her tend'ry ties are riven,  
For the sordid love of gold;

And her children from her driven,  
'Human chattels' to be sold.

Then must woman seek to smother,  
Feelings which her Maker gave!

Pity for the wife and mother,  
Bowed in sorrow to the grave.

Must we seek our lips to fetter,  
When our nature bids us plead?

By our silence be the abster,  
Causing woman's heart to bleed?

No! though man may still revile us,  
Though the nation spurns our prayer;

Mercy's voice shall still inspire us,  
We will plead till they shall spare.

New York, 11th mo. 1838.

## WO TO THE LAND.

Wo to the land where all the words of truth,  
Are made of none effect.  
Where love is cherished into hate forsooth.  
And God hath no respect.

Wo to the land where mercy hath no pleading,  
Where Righteousness, and Truth, and Love lie blood

S. E. P.

## NON-RESISTANCE.

[SELECTED.]  
HUMAN GOVERNMENTS; CIVIL AND ECCLESIASTICAL. NO. I.

All governments are founded upon one of two distinct, and to some extent, conflicting assumptions. The advocates of popular governments take the ground that man has an inherent right, as an independent sovereign, to take the government and protection of himself into his own hands; or, in other words, to erect laws for his own government, and to retain upon those who do him injury. This is the only consistent ground which such persons can occupy, as men, as *individuals*, to exercise those rights, which no confederation or combination of any given number of such individuals can ever create them. If a single cent does not possess the least particle of God; the powers that are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and that they resist shall receive to themselves damnation? Rom. xiii. 2. Two things are to be observed in this passage: 1. No positive support, by active obedience, such as is rendered to moral precept, is required for the performance of any of these assumptions—all that is required is simple resistance. 2. No exception or proviso is made; it is neither expressed nor implied, that resistance can be innocently made in any case whatever—on the contrary, the prohibition is absolute and unqualified; and insists upon an unvarying and uniform submission at all times, in all circumstances, in all cases of whatever nature. Again: 'Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether to the king as supreme; or unto governors, unto them that are sent for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the cause of them that do well.' 1 Tim. ii. 15. Hence, moral, qualified and uniform submission is required; but not because the ordinances of man are morally right, or possess any just authority, but because the Lord requires it—for the Lord's sake.' Now we presume that no man will take the ground, that every civil ruler is a genuine representative of God, such as Moses was, in connection with the administration of a divine moral government, nor that any civil enactment is a divine moral precept; and if any of them are not, then needlessly to insist upon them as the vicegerents of Almighty God; or, if they cannot be adduced as evidence from the Bible, or from some other source of equal authority, then the same have no more claim to the name of the authority.

The irreconcileable inference is, that all human governments are connected only with that providential government, which takes in all things both good and bad, and which wisely overrules all the evil for good—that they possess no more legal or moral authority than any other instruments of divine providence, which are either purely evil, or are incapable of possessing or exhibiting moral qualities.

But will it said, that 'human governments are ordained of God.' So far as the forms and penitences, with all their subdivisions, are but derivatives of his righteous government. His laws recognize every possible case of criminality, hence the enactment of other or additional laws by men, are to say the least, unnecessary, if they are not an implied impeachment of the divine wisdom and goodness.

2. When men take the government of themselves independent of their lawful and only sovereign, the Lord Almighty. It is the very thing which makes men rebels against the laws and government of God—it is put into the mouth of the serpent in the garden of the fall of all the earth—it is the creature endeavoring to wrench the reins of the governmental chariot out of the hands of the Creator, and is the very essence of that 'carnal mind which is enmity against God.'

3. It is an incontrovertible truth, that man never did, and never will, and never can govern himself. He was made to be governed, not by himself, but by the mightiest, wisest, and best of Beings; and so far as man has been kept within the bounds even of probation, he has been governed by the hand of God, punishing, but to a great extent, unwise providence of God from whom cometh every good and perfect gift. It is said, both by politicians and priests, that the government of this country may properly be denominated an *experiment*, designed to prove the sufficiency of man to govern himself; and the failure of this experiment is equally deprecat by both, inasmuch as it will extinguish the last hope of the world, in regard to this momentous question. To both these classes of men we can say with the most undoubting confidence, YOUR EXPERIMENT WILL FAIL! This has every similar one to the former, whether it be a *theoretical*, or to a *practical* one.

4. We deny that man has the right to take the protection of himself into his own hands by retaliating upon others who do him injury, or in other words, to render evil for evil in any case whatever. The Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles have most clearly and decisively set forth this doctrine. 'He that hateth his brother shall smite him on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any man shall surely make it good; but for a beast he that killeth a beast shall surely make it good; but for a beast he who shall smite another shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Matt. v. 38-40. Let it be distinctly observed, that the reference here made by Christ to the principle of retaliation is made in the very words of the Jewish *civil code*, which was instituted by Jehovah himself; see Lev. xxiv. 21. 'He that killeth any